

BULLETIN

OF THE IV CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

№ 14-15.

Moscow.

24 th November 1922.

Fourteenth Session.

November 18 th.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Contents.

„Programme of the Communist International“.

Speakers: Bukharin, Thalheimer.

Bukharin: Comrades, you are all aware that we shall not adopt a final program at this Congress, owing to the fact that many of our Parties have not defined their attitude towards this question. Even the Russian Party has not had the opportunity to discuss the draft which I now present to you. Therefore, most of the delegations are of the opinion that it will be more expedient not to adopt a final program at this Congress, but to discuss the program now and bring it up for adoption at the next Congress. The fact, however, that we have placed so important and difficult a question as that of an International program on the agenda of the World Congress, is in itself the best evidence of our mighty growth. We may express our perfect confidence that the Communist International will also solve this problem, whereas in the camp of our adversaries of the Second and Two and a Half Internationals we observe complete theoretical impotence. (Clara Zetkin: Perfectly true).

Before dealing with the various questions before me I will first of all take up the fundamental questions of the theory and program of the Second International before the war. The thesis which I propound is that the theory upon which the Second International was based before the war was responsible for its collapse

during the war. Generally we may distinguish three phases in the development of the Marxian theory and its ideological construction: the first phase was the Marxism of Marx and Engels themselves, then followed the second phase which was the Marxism of the Second International, the Marxism of its founders. At the present time we have the third phase of Marxism: the Bolshevik or Communist Marxism which is to a large extent reverting back to the original Marxism of Marx and Engels. The original Marxism of Marx and Engels was the child of the European revolution of 1848 and therefore possessed a highly revolutionary spirit.

This revolutionary character of the Marxian theory is explained by the fact that the doctrines of Marx and Engels were evolved at a time when the whole of Europe was in the throes of revolution and the proletariat as a revolutionary class was entering the arena of world history. Then followed a different period and with a different ideological tendency. This entire historic development once more demonstrates to us what we observe in the history of nearly all ideologies, namely, that an ideology which has been born under certain conditions will under different conditions assume a different expression and develop

into a different form. This is what occurred with the Marxian doctrine. Following the revolutionary epoch of the middle of last century, an entirely different historic epoch in the development of the capitalist system set in. It was the epoch of the gigantic growth of capitalism. This growth was chiefly based upon the colonial policy of the bourgeoisie, and the stupendous development of continental industry was chiefly stimulated by the exploitation of the colonial peoples. This growth and prosperity of continental industry caused a variety of social re-alignments within the European nations. The position of the working class was strengthened in the economic sense of the word. At the same time capitalist development created a considerable community of interests between the bourgeoisie and the continental working class. This community of interests between the continental bourgeoisie and the continental proletariat was the basis for a great psychological and ideological tendency manifesting itself within the working class and, ergo, within the Socialist Parties.

Then came the second phase in the development of Marxism namely, the phase of Social-Democratic Marxism, the well known Marxism of the Marxist theoreticians. The struggle between the orthodox tendency and the reformist tendency, the great struggle between orthodox social democracy represented by Kautsky on the one hand against the Revisionists as represented by Edouard Bernstein on the other—ended in the triumph of orthodox Marxism. However, when we look back on the entire history of this struggle, the complete surrender of orthodox Marxism to Revisionist Marxism stands clear before our eyes. I support the thesis that in this struggle, which took place a long time before the war, so-called orthodox Marxism, i. e., the Marxism of Karl Kautsky, surrendered to Revisionism in the most fundamental theoretical questions. This we failed to notice. Now we see clearly and distinctly, and thoroughly comprehend the underlying reasons of this phenomena. Let us for instance consider the question of the impoverishment theory! You are all aware that Kautskian Marxism argued this question in a milder form that that

in which it was stated by Marx himself. It was asserted that in the epoch of capitalist development the working class suffers a relative deterioration of its condition. The inherent law of capitalist development consists in that the condition of the working class improves, but in relation to the condition of the bourgeoisie, it deteriorates: Thus Kautsky defended this apparently Marxian view against the attacks of Bernstein. I consider this interpretation of Kautsky incorrect and contend that this theoretical position is based on an empirical view of the conditions of the European and the American working class. Marx, however, in his theory analysed an abstract capitalist development which leads to a deterioration of the condition of the working class. What did Kautskian Marxism do? By the term working class it understood exclusively the continental working class.

The condition of these strata of the proletariat went on improving, but Kautskian Marxism did not realise that this improvement in the condition of the continental working classes was bought at the price of the annihilation and spoliation of the colonial peoples. Marx was speaking of capitalist society as a whole. Now, if we wish to be somewhat more concrete than Marx we should not confine our scope of observation to the American and European countries, but should extend it to world economy as a whole. In that case we would obtain a totally different theoretical picture from the one that has been drawn by Kautsky and his followers. Thus, from the theoretical standpoint Kautsky's thesis was not correct. It was an act of surrender to the attack of Revisionism. Let us now take up another question, the theory of collapse and the rising of the proletariat. This catastrophic theory of collapse was much softened down by Kautsky in his controversy with the Revisionists. With regard to the revolution, the result of the collapse, we notice even in the more revolutionary of the Kautsky writing, (e.g. his "The Road to Power") a great number of really comical passages, of preposterously exaggerated opportunism. Let us take, for instance, his varying opinions on the general strike in his book on "the Social Revolution," where Kautsky asserts that if we are in a position to make the revolu-

tion then we need no general strike. If not—we do not need one either. What does it mean? It means nothing but pure opportunism, which we did not quite notice before, but which we see quite clearly now.

Let us take the third theoretical question, namely, the theory of the State. Here I shall have to speak at somewhat greater length. On the outbreak of the war we thought that Kautskianism had suddenly betrayed its own theories. This is what we thought and wrote at the time. But we were wrong. We can now quite calmly admit that we were wrong. Quite the contrary happened: the so-called betrayal by the social-democrats and the Kautskians was based on the theory which these theoreticians had already maintained before the outbreak of the war. What were their statements about the State and the conquest of political power by the proletariat? They represented the case as though there was some object which had been in the hands of one class, and later passed into the possession of another class. This was also the way Kautsky saw it.

Let us now take the case of the imperialist war. If we now consider the State as a homogeneous instrument which changed hands in passing from one epoch to another, i. e., as almost a neutral thing, then it is perfectly conceivable that we should protect this instrument on the outbreak of war when the proletariat has the prospect of conquering the State in this manner. During the World War the question of protecting the State was brought to the forefront. This idea was thought out to its logical conclusions, and it was quite a logical consequence of this theory when Kautsky raised the question of National defence and answered that question in the affirmative.

The same with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Even in debate with the Revisionists Kautsky never developed this question. He almost failed to say a single word upon this most important question and most important problem during the whole of that controversy. He said something to the effect that this question would be solved by future generations. That was his way of "stating the problem".

Comrades, when we examine these men-

tal excursions and attempt to discover in them the sociological equivalent, we must declare that we have here an alleged Marxian ideology that was based on the aristocratic position of these strata of the continental workers, whose improved condition was secured by the spoliation of the colonial workers. This Thesis on the sociologic basis of Kautskianism is indeed admitted by the theoreticians of the Second International. These fellows have become so arrogant that they no longer need to wear a mask. In his treatise on the problem Kautsky makes this very diagnosis and sees nothing bad in the fact that:

"Indeed the proletariat is not quite homogeneous. We have already seen that it is divided into two strata: In the first place are those that are exceptionally favoured by economic circumstances or by legislation, who are strongly organised and are in a position to defend their interests; these are the superlative part of the proletariat, its "aristocracy" capable of successfully resisting the oppressive tendencies of capitalism, because to them the struggle against capitalism is not merely a struggle against poverty but a struggle for power."

This contradistinction between the struggle against poverty and the struggle for power is also a "very Marxian" figure of speech! He goes on to say!

"By the side of these well disciplined, trained and efficient (i. e. licking the boots of generals) troops there stands the great army of those (mark you, he cannot deny this) that are placed in such unfavourable circumstances that they are not yet in a position to organise themselves and to overcome the oppressive tendencies of capitalism. These remain in poverty and sink deeper and deeper in the mire.

Kautsky further on makes attempts to define his tactical differences from us, the Communist International, who do not rely upon the labour aristocracy but on the most oppressed strata, and this is what he has to say on the question:

"Thanks to its ignorance and inexperience, its ardent longing for improved conditions and liberty, it

easily becomes the prey of all demagogues (i. e. the communists) who, either deliberately or lightmindedly (this is his sociological analysis), will coax it by means of tempting promises into the fight against the trained and well organised elements that are accustomed to choosing their battle ground and to take up only such tasks as they are well prepared and trained for", and so forth and so forth.

There is a novel by Jack London, "The Iron Heel". Jack London, who is not a particularly good Marxian, understood quite well the problem of the modern labour movement. He saw quite well that the bourgeoisie not only attempted but actually succeeded in splitting the working class into two parts by corrupting one part, namely the trained and skilled part of the proletariat, and using this labour aristocracy as a means for suppressing every upheaval of the working class. What Jack London so ably depicted from the point of view of the workers is not understood by theoreticians of the Second International. He exploits the tragedy of the working class—its internal division—to support bourgeois society. This constitutes the function of Social Democracy, Now, after many years of war and revolution, these fellows are shameless enough to rake up this muck and to give it a theoretical basis. The sociological basis of this Kautskian Marxism is so clear that one would think that it could not be any clearer. Yet, on considering this problem once more in the form that it had been presented in the theories of the Second International, we obtain an even clearer picture. On reading their new publications, especially the latest book of Kautsky, we do not find a single word about the all-important problem of the theory of impoverishment. It is absolutely inconceivable that at a time when the tendency of capitalism stands out on all prominence, when everything is at the straining point, when we witness the discarding of all mask, that Kautsky should not have a word to say on the most important problem. But on reading some of their other writings, apart from the book of Kautsky, we find the key to the solution of this mystery of silence. There is a book in Germany that has

been specially written for the young, by a certain Herr Abraham. This book has been widely spread among the young people and I believe translated into other languages. This gentleman states his thesis quite arrogantly and cynically: "Marxism was saved by Revisionism!" He tells us that we need no Marxist theory for the revisionism of Bernstein has saved for the working class the true elements of Marxism. This is his main thesis. The gentleman goes on to analyse the position of the working class, and attempts to say something about our communist assertion and he advances the following Theses (!) "the case was not so previously, the conditions were always improving. He ignores the colonial peoples and the coolies. His second thesis is even more striking: "The present situation, with the currency chaos, with the real impoverishment of some strata, is such that cannot be analysed from the standpoint of any sociological laws". Thus, we are not in a position to analyse these things. If we should consider this as a serious statement, we would say: Give us a mystical explanation, made up both of mystics and mist (laughter). The tactical sense is that these fellows seek to evade the argument before the working class by the silly assertion that we are not in a position to explain the present situation, that the situation is so complex that we cannot understand anything. The real reason why they cannot understand is because we are now in the period when the theory of collapse is working out in actual practice.

They are unable to analyse the revolution, they cannot produce an analysis that would furnish the basis for practical revolutionary decisions. They are evasive when they say: There is no logic in the events of our time.

Let us take for instance the theory of the crisis. With regard to this theory, Kautsky asserts that in our present theoretical consideration of the development of the capitalist system, we should admit quite frankly that the theory of crisis should assume "more modest dimensions" in our argument. What does it mean? It means that Kautsky asserts that the capitalist world has become more harmonious in recent times. This assertion is naturally the embodiment of pure

stupidity. The facts prove the opposite. We now find complete vindication of the theses and the theory of crises has been proven up to the hilt. We can even maintain now that the war itself was a specific form of economic crisis, and it is this specific form that we should theoretically conceive and theoretically analyse. And when these fellows now discuss the revolution, a real flesh and blood proletarian revolution, they say: This is not a true revolution; we will wait for a "real" revolution. There are bourgeois scholars who deny leaps in nature and science, although these are empirical facts. Thus, when Kautsky says: "The revolution in Russia has been achieved, but it is not a proletarian, not a real, true revolution." We are in the midst of the collapse, the greatest crisis known in history, yet he does not see the crisis when he declares: "In our theoretical consideration of the theory of crises we ought to be more modest." These are simply the ravings of opportunists gone mad, who have completely lost the sense for realities, who pretend to discuss the logic of history when their own brain is bereft thereof (laughter). One of these gentlemen, for instance, goes so far as to say that capitalism has emerged even stronger from the war. Here you have the "theoretical proportions." The ordinary liberals, the pacifists, the clericals, the bourgeois economists, nearly all of them, more or less, understand the economic weakness of the capitalist world. Not one of them denies it. Nevertheless, we have a social-democrat, a supposed Marxian, who comes along to tell us that capitalism has even been strengthened by the war. This sounds almost like an exhortation in favour of a new war. If capitalism becomes stronger in consequence of a war, then it should be tried once more! This comical standpoint is now maintained in all seriousness by theoreticians of the Second International.

Let us now proceed to the theory of the State. This theory of the State has now been transformed by all the theoreticians of the Second International without exception into a direct plea for a bourgeois republic. Not a single attempt has been made at understanding anything, at a single idea, it is but a pure plea for the bourgeois republic. It is no use

arguing with these people; they are absolutely hopeless; they only know one thing, to plead for a bourgeois republic. In this respect there is absolutely no difference between the bourgeois liberal scholars and the social democrats. On reading the writings of Cunow, for instance, we find that some of the bourgeois professors, like Franz Oppenheimer and others, notably those of the Gumplovitz school, are much nearer to the Marxian position than he. Cunow in his book claims the State to be a sort of universal welfare institution, a good father to all its children, whether of the working class or of the bourgeoisie. So the matter stands. I once said that this is a theory that was represented by the Babylonian king Hamurabi. And this is the theoretical of the level representatives and principal sages of the Second International.

But there are theoretical betrayals which are even more flagrant and ignominious. I refer to the conception of Kautsky with regard to the proletarian revolution and to the coalition government. To write such stuff one has indeed to lose the last vestige of theoretical consciousness. Take for instance, Kautsky's theory about the revolution. Do you know what is his latest discovery on this question? (1) The bourgeois revolution has to act by violence (2) The proletarian revolution, precisely because it is a proletarian revolution, must not employ violence, or as another of these gentlemen has said, violence is always a reactionary force. We know what Engels has written about the revolution, in an Italian article entitled "Dell Autorita". He wrote "The revolution is the most authoritative thing in the world; for revolution means an historic event, when one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part of the population by means of bayonets, guns and rifles". Such was the conception of revolutionary Marxism. And now we hear what the miserable Herr Kautsky has to tell us: "Bayonets, guns and other means of violence are purely bourgeois means. They have not been invented by the proletariat, but by the bourgeoisie. The barricade is a pure bourgeois institution" (laughter). In this way one could argue almost anything. Kautsky might, for

instance, say "Before the bourgeois revolution the bourgeoisie fought with ideas; consequently this is a purely bourgeois method: It would follow then that we must discard all ideas. Perhaps Kautsky has discarded all ideas now (Laughter). It would be really ridiculous to adopt such a method of reasoning.

Now we come to the question of the coalition. Here we reach the apex of all the discoveries of Kautsky. Kautsky believes himself to be the representative of orthodox Marxism. Marx maintained that the spirit of his teaching consisted of the doctrine of the proletarian dictatorship. There is a passage in Marx which reads: "The class struggle was known to many others before me, but my teaching consists of the knowledge that the development of capitalism leads inevitably to the dictatorship of the proletariat". This was the way Marx himself conceived his theory. This is the sum and substance of the Marxian doctrine. Now listen to what Kautsky writes: "In his famous article on the criticism of social-democratic programme, Marx wrote:

"Between the capitalists and the communist society intervenes the revolutionary stage of transition from one into the other. This has its corresponding period of political transition, when the State can be nothing else but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat".

So said Marx.

And Kautsky, what has he to say? Let me quote him literally: "This sentence we should now modify on the basis of our recent experiences, and on the question of Government we should say:

"Between the time of the pure bourgeois and the time of the pure proletarian democratic State, there is a period of transition from one into the other. This has its corresponding period of political transition, when the Government as a rule should take the form of a coalition government" (Laughter).

This is indeed not a form of transition from Marxism to Revisionism, but it is even worse than the purest Revisionism. Here we have to deal with a number of betrayals. Marx could see communism at the other end of the transition period.

Kautsky sees none. He tells us of transition from the pure capitalist government to a pure democratic proletarian government, but where does communism come in? He provides no room for ourselves as to what is the real purpose of this substituting of coalition for dictatorship. It is therefore not at all surprising when some bourgeois theoreticians declare quite sensibly that there is nothing left of Marxism in the mind of the theoreticians of the Second International.

There is, for instance, in Germany certain, wise, but very cynical professor (Laughter) Hans Delbrueck, who, after perusal of various writings of the Second International, in an article in one of the issues of the "Prussian Year Books" writes literally as follows:

"The difference between us bourgeois social political thinkers and them (meaning Kautsky etc.) is one of degree. A few more steps along this road, gentlemen, and the communist mist will have dispersed."

This is a very good quotation. A bourgeois professor, an adherent of Kautsky, Wilhelm, tells the theoreticians of pseudo-Marxism, of a pseudo "international" of "revolutionary" social democracy that there is no difference between bourgeois thinkers and Kautsky and Co. This is a quotation which throws a clear light upon the whole situation. Even in theory it seems to be an element of tactics and strategy, which corresponds to the actual political tactics and strategy. On the social chess-board of which its different classes, parties, groups, and sub-groups we sustained many set-backs and the greatest of them, was the splitting up of the proletariat in consequence of the political betrayal of the social-democratic parties and the leaders of the trade unions, which brought about a bloc of some of the elements of the labour movement with the bourgeoisie. On a number of occasions we witnessed also the theoretical bloc between the pseudo-Marxists and the bourgeois philosophers. Such is the situation we now behold in the theories of the Second International. In theory and in practice it is only the Communist International that represents

the truly revolutionary standpoint, and consequently the Communist International alone represents the real theory of Marxism.

I now turn to another question. Having disposed of the theoreticians of the Second International, I wish to say a few words on the new analysis of the present epoch, with particular reference to a point which has not been as yet fully elucidated. First of all, I will put the question: From what point of view is it most advisable to examine the development of capitalism as a whole? There must indeed be some kind of a theoretical pivot in the consideration of the entire process of capitalist development. What pivot shall we choose! We naturally have several to choose from. We can either regard the position of the working class as being the definite crystallisation of the concentration of capital, or we can construct our programme from the standpoint of the formation of new elements of society or some other features of capitalist development. But I think that the capitalist development as a whole should be considered from the standpoint of the expanded reproduction of capitalist contradictions, and it is from this standpoint that we ought to consider all the processes of capitalist development. We have now reached a stage of development when capitalism is breaking up. To some extent we already consider capitalist development as in retrospect, but this does not prevent us from considering all the events of the capitalist epoch, including even the prognosis, from the standpoint of the steady and constant reproduction of capitalist contradictions. The war is the expression of the contradictions inherent in capitalist competition. We ought to explain the meaning of war solely as the expanded reproduction of the anarchistic structure of capitalist society. If this accentuation of the contradictions has already led to the impossibility of continued existence of capitalist society, this standpoint can also serve the purpose of elucidating all the other questions, such as the grouping of the working class, the social divisions of society, the position of the working class and the structure of modern society.

The second question to my mind is the

question of imperialism. I am not going into a complete analysis of the entire epoch of imperialism, because the theoretical answer to this question is quite obvious to us as communists. I only wish to emphasise a point which I consider of importance, namely, "How are the specific forms of the policy of violence of financial capital to be explained? Many explanations have been given. It was explained by the monopolist character of capitalism and by other things. Yet I think there is still another very important factor in the answer to this question. Political economy in the past, including also the Marxian theory, treated the subject of capitalist contradiction as something peculiar to industrial capitalism. It was an epoch of competition between the various industrialists whose methods consisted of lowering the price of commodities. This is almost the only sort of competition mentioned by Marx. But in the epoch of imperialist capitalism we find many other forms of competition wherein the method of reducing prices is of no significance. When a coal syndicate, for instance, fights an iron syndicate for surplus value, it is to be assumed that these syndicates will not resort to the method of reducing prices. It would be preposterous to assume that they would fight exclusively by means of some violent method like the boycott, etc. The main groups of the bourgeoisie are now in the nature of trustified groups within the framework of the State. They are nothing else but combined enterprises.

It is quite conceivable that such a form of enterprise, such a construction of competing groups, should resort chiefly to violent methods of competition. The international sub-division of labour, the existence of agrarian and industrial countries the various combinations of industrial branches within the same imperialist State, bring about a situation where no other policy can be adopted. The policy of low prices is almost an impossibility. Thus arise the new forms of competition which lead to military attack by the State.

I would now like to touch upon a third point that ought to be mentioned in the programme, namely, the emphasising of the rôle of the State, in general and the rôle of the State at the present moment in particular. We should admit

quite frankly that the Marxian theory, and even orthodox Marxism, did not investigate the question of the State quite thoroughly. We know that some of our past leaders have tackled this question and solved it in a treacherous manner. But we should ask ourselves whether there have been any revolutionary Marxians who have made a thorough study of the question. What does it mean? It means that the Marxian theory was evolved during a period strongly tinged with Manchester hues. Free competition reigned supreme. This situation had its roots in the specific conditions of the epoch. But this should not satisfy us. The rôle of the State is very important from all points of view, from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie as well as from the standpoint of the proletariat. On the one hand we are to destroy an organisation, and it is therefore important for us to know the situation as it existed previously so that we may create something of economic relations. All these circumstances should urge upon us the necessity of emphasising the question of the State and giving it prominent place in our programme.

I would further urge that we include in our programme something about the monopoly of education by the ruling class. We used to ignore this question in discussing our programmes in the past, but now, when the proletariat is striving for power and for the reorganisation of society, such questions as the training of our officials and administrators, the standard of education of our leaders before and after the conquest of power, must play an important part. All these questions are of great importance, yet they were never discussed before, because they did not appear to us to be practical questions. Now they have become absolutely practical questions, and for this reason we should give more place to this question than we have given before.

I think that in our programme we should touch upon the question of the specific symptoms of the maturing of socialism within the capitalist society. It is a classical passage in the Marxian doctrine, that the germs of the new society are generated in the womb of the old. But this theory

has caused so much confusion in the ranks of the Second International that we should state the question more concretely than we did before. I cannot touch upon the question in its entirety, but this much I would like to say: We all know that the proletarian revolution imposes many demands upon us, that the proletarian revolution is at times accompanied by a deterioration of productive forces. This is an inherent law of proletarian revolution. But our opponents want to tell us that this is due to the fact that capitalism is not yet ripe for socialism. This is their main theoretical thesis in which they confuse the maturing of capitalism within the feudal system with the maturing of socialism within the capitalist society. But we want to emphasise the difference of principle between the two phenomena. At all events, we should lay down the conditions of the construction of socialist society. The difference between the two types of maturing consists in that capitalism has grown out of the feudal system from A to Z. The whole apparatus of society from the workers to the ruling bourgeoisie had grown to maturity within the feudal system. Socialism could never even under the most favourable conditions, grow out of capitalism in such a manner. It is impossible for the working class to gain control of production within the capitalist society. It is nonsense; it is a flagrant contradiction. For this reason the special features of the maturing of socialism within the capitalist society are totally different in character from the maturing of capitalism within the feudal system. Indeed, how is the proletariat, without economic, political and cultural preparation, without its own engineers etc., to run the new State, if obtained without previously having established the dictatorship of the proletariat? It is only after the revolution that the proletariat breaks open the doors of the higher institutes of learning. We must admit that at present the proletariat is relatively untrained, ignorant and backward, as compared with the bourgeoisie. It means that the proletariat cannot become the mature organiser of society within capitalism. The proletariat can become the leader of society as a whole, the real creative genius of society, only after the Dictatorship. It cannot be in

any other way. This is the cardinal difference between the maturing of capitalism and the development of socialism that we ought to emphasise. Our opponents entertain the foolish idea that we could mature within the bourgeois society just as capitalism grew out of feudalism. Unfortunately, this is not the case, and we should always bear in mind the specific difference between the two situations.

I would further like to touch upon one more point which has not been sufficiently analysed, even in our literature, namely the problem of growing into the socialist state. The Revisionists have spoken much about this problem of growing into the socialist state. The revisionist conception was that the capitalist state would gradually evolve into socialism. It cannot be gainsaid that we will not accomplish our aims by means of decrees alone, that it will be a lengthy process of organisation before we really establish our socialist state. But the difference between us and the Revisionists is on the point of time when this evolution begins. The revisionists, who do not want the revolution, maintain that this process begins within the capitalist state. We say that it begins only after the proletariat has established its dictatorship. The proletariat should first of all destroy the old bourgeois State and capture the power, and by this means change the economic relations. Here we have a long process of development when the socialist forms of production and distribution grow continuously, displacing all the remnants of capitalist economy, until the total transformation of the capitalist State into the socialist is accomplished. There is yet another point which has direct bearing on the preceding question, namely the question of the national types of socialism, as a form of production, of course. Before the revolution we discussed methods of systematic production, collective economy etc., without having any concrete idea. Now, particularly after the experiences of the Russian Revolution, we see that we have before us a long period of various national types of socialist production. Let us, for instance, compare French capitalism with American capitalism. French capitalism had its special features that distinguish it from American Capitalism. Let us compare the

nature of the usurious French capitalism as compared with the refined financial capitalism of America, or the history of the syndicates and trusts in Germany and England. These are different ways and different methods. All this, of course, becomes obliterated in the course of time, along with the development of world economy. But socialism can grow exclusively upon that which is already in existence, and therefore it may be assumed that the various socialist forms will in a certain sense be the continuation of the previous capitalist forms, but under a different aspect; which means that the specific features of capitalism of the different countries will find their expression in the specific forms of socialist production in those countries. Later on, of course, these differences will be obliterated by the onward march of proletarian rule. The initial stage of development in all countries, even after the conquest of political power by the proletariat, will still have its various forms of socialist production. We may frankly state that Russian socialism will appear as Asiatic in comparison with the others. The backwardness of our industry and agriculture and our retarded economic development will surely find their expression in the backward forms of our socialism. If we take all this into consideration, we may then pass to the discussion of other questions, such as the question of the new economic policy. This is the eighth point upon which I intended to say a few words here. This new economic policy may be viewed from the totally different standpoints, from the standpoint of revolutionary tactics or from the standpoint of economic rationalism. These are two standpoints which do not always appear to be identical. From the tactical standpoint we have already heard the views of several comrades, including Comrades Lenin and Trotsky. I would like to examine this question from the standpoint of economic rationalism.

I maintain that the proletariat of every individual country, after gaining political power, will be confronted by the important problem of economic organisation, the problem of proportion between the forms of production, which the proletariat should organise upon a rational plan. This is the most important economic

problem with which the proletariat will be confronted. If the proletariat fails to fix this proportion aright, if it undertakes too much, it will eventually be confronted by the situation in which the productive forces will not be developed, but rather hampered. The proletariat is not in a position to organise everything. The proletariat cannot carry out plans for the forcible displacement of small peasants and the individual traders. The proletariat, by arbitrarily removing these strata can really gain no material compensation. It would only mean a blocking of the channels of circulation and the further shrinking of the productive forces, which would mean the continued dilapidation of the economic life of the country.

There is yet another drawback in the proletariat undertaking great schemes without due appreciation of the rational facts of economics. If the proletariat should try to control too much, it would require a gigantic administrative machine, with too many officials and functionaries to take the place of these small producers, small peasants etc., in their economic functions. This attempt of substituting petty officialdom for these petty producers would eventually produce a tremendous bureaucratic machine which will be more costly than profitable. We would eventually have a form of administration, where the entire economic machinery of the proletarian States does not mean the development of the productive forces, but the hampering of the development of the productive forces; in other words, the very opposite of what it ought to be. Such a bureaucratic machine would have to be stopped either through a counter-revolution of the small peasantry, or by the Party stepping in and reorganising the whole thing, as has been the case here in Russia. If the proletariat does not perform the necessary operation it will be done by other forces. This should be fully realised by all our Comrades.

I therefore say the new economic policy is on the one hand a specific Russian phenomenon, yet on the other hand it is also a universal phenomenon (quite true!) It is not exclusively a strategic retreat, but it is also the solution of a great problem of social organisation, na-

mely the proportion between the various branches of production which we should rationalise, and the branches of production which we are not able to rationalise. Comrades, let us be frank. We have made the attempt of organising everything here, even the peasants and the millions of small producers. The result was that we had a gigantic bureaucratic machine, incurred tremendous administrative expenditures, reached a political crisis, and finally we were compelled, in order to save ourselves, Comrade Lenin has stated quite frankly in order to save the cause of the proletariat to introduce this new economic policy. This is by no means, some comrades are inclined to think something in the nature of a shameful disease that should be concealed. It is merely a concession to the opponent who is fighting us with all his forces, it is also the correct solution of a problem of social organisation. Frankly stated, it amounts to this. When under the old economic policy we witnessed incidents of our Red Militia in Moscow dispersing some old women selling bread etc. it was from the standpoint of rational economics a madhouse. And when this was properly understood, the madhouse had to be transformed into something better. Some comrades are inclined to think that it was a sin from the standpoint of orthodox Marxism. It was not our sin, but it was the necessary corrective on the part of our Party of mistakes which we committed in our first proletarian revolution owing to our inexperience and ignorance. This is our view on the question. And I say: the problem of the new economic policy is of International importance. The specific Russian aspect consists, of course, in the proportion that we could rationalise and those that we could not.

We have a great many peasants, small producers, etc. But if we take the most developed industrial countries, say Germany or America, do you think that this problem would not bubble up even there? Indeed, it would at once. Could we, for instance, proceed right away with the reorganisation of the American farmers? Of course not! For such strata the free economic movement should remain. The same would be the case in Germany.

Do you believe that the victorious proletariat would at once be able to organise on a communist basis all the bourgeois economies, particularly in Bavaria? Of course not! Do you know what the peasant will tell you when you will demand of him the surrender of his grain. He will tell you that he wants to be free to sell it as he sees fit. For this reason this problem ought to be constantly kept in mind also in Germany, giving due consideration to the question, to what extent should economy be socialised, and to what extent should it be allowed freedom. Such is the scope of the new economic policy. But this problem is also connected, with yet a different problem. It happens that in a revolution the principle of economic rationalism clashes with another principle, that is of equal importance to the proletariat, namely the principle of the pure political expediency. Of this I have frequently quoted examples. For instance, if for the purpose of erecting barricades you saw down telegraph posts, it stands to reason that you are not thereby increasing the productive forces (Laughter). The same thing happens in a revolution. For instance, if the capitalist bourgeoisie lets loose all its forces against you and has its agents among the petty bourgeoisie who directly carry out the orders of the big bourgeoisie, what should the proletariat do? The proletariat must at all costs destroy these petty bourgeois alliances with the big bourgeoisie. As the struggle develops, it is bound to remove also the economic basis of this petty bourgeoisie. Here we get the unrational thing, which is economically inexpedient, but which from the standpoint of the political struggle and the triumph in the civil war is quite a means to an end. These two standpoints, economic rationality and political expediency, are not at all identical, frequently they come into collision. The prime consideration, however, should be that it is impossible to build up socialism without previously establishing the proletarian State. But we must always use our discretion and refrain from doing anything superfluous, anything that is inexpedient from the standpoint of the political struggle and irrational from the economic standpoint. I cannot naturally

go on developing these ideas, but the problem is quite obvious, and it can be examined in the light of the different classes, strata, and groups of the body politics. Here again we have to consider our attitude to the middle class, to the so-called intelligentsia, i. e., to the new middle class, then again our attitude to the various strata of the peasantry. All this, we have to provide for in our programme. At the same time we naturally want to get the full value of the experiences of the Russian Revolution, for it were folly if we fail to make good use of the experience of the greatest revolution.

I now come to the fourth sub-section, which I designate as the new universal tactical problems. So far, I was examining various problems of a purely theoretical nature, now I wish to discuss also some problems which are of universal tactical character, and which in a sense should be designated as programmatical.

Firstly, quite briefly, on the question of the colonies. For this question we must devote more space in our programme than we have done hitherto. (Quite right). We are now making the attempt to write an International programme. The aristocratic flavor of the books of Kautsky and Co. has to be blotted out. We must understand that in the process of world revolution we have our reserves in the colonial countries which are of the greatest importance. We must therefore deal with this question far more exhaustively than has been the case hitherto.

The second tactical problem is that of National Defence. This problem was to us, communists, quite clear from the outbreak of the war, and our attitude was almost a flat rejection of the national defence, but now we see something modified and more complex. The essential complicating factor in this question is the fact that in one country we have a proletarian dictatorship; and the existence of a proletarian State changes immediately the whole situation. Above all, we as Marxians and dialecticians should take full stock of such changes in the situation. I will only quote one instance. When we were a revolutionary opposition party it was quite natural that we could not think for a moment of any bourgeois

State advancing us money to aid our revolutionary activity. It would have been sheer folly to expect it. The moment we obtained money from any hostile power, the whole of our cause would have been discredited. The International bourgeoisie therefore handled this problem quite properly from its own standpoint when it attempted to misrepresent us as the agents of German imperialism, or Karl Liebknecht as the agent of the French bourgeoisie. We were always aware of this, and we never countenance the idea of receiving enemy aid of any kind. But now when a proletarian State exists and is in a position to contract a loan from some bourgeois state, it would be foolish to reject it on principle. I am quoting this merely as a small example of the various questions of principle that arise from the moment that a proletarian State comes into existence.

It is the same with the question of national defence. It is quite clear what is meant by a proletarian country, i.e., the proletarian State (for in all these questions the word nation is synonymous with the word State, with the respective class characteristic). When the bourgeoisie speaks of the national defence, it means the defence of the bourgeois State; and when we speak of national defence we mean the defence of the Proletarian State. It ought therefore to be stated clearly in our programme that the proletarian State should and must be protected not only by the proletariat of this country, but also by the proletariat of all countries. This is the new situation of the question where it differs from the situation at the outbreak of the war. The second question is: should the proletarian States, for reasons of the strategy of the proletariat as a whole, conclude any military alliances with the bourgeois States? Here there is no difference in principle between a loan and a military alliance. And I maintain that we have already grown so big that we are in a position to conclude a military alliance with a bourgeois State for the purpose of destroying some other bourgeois State with the help of the bourgeois ally. What would happen later on, under a certain re-adjustment of forces, you can easily imagine for yourselves. This is a question of purely strategical and tactical expediency. In this manner it should be stated in our programme.

Under this form of national defence, i.e., the military alliance with bourgeois States, it is the duty of the comrades of every country to aid this alliance to develop. If in its subsequent phase of development, the bourgeoisie of such a country should be overthrown, then other questions arise (Laughter) which it is not our duty to outline here, but which you can readily conceive.

Next we should make mention of a technical point, of the right of Red Intervention. This is to my mind the touchstone for all communist parties. There is a widespread outcry about Red Intervention. We should make it plain in our programme that every proletarian State has the right of Red intervention. (Radek, interposes: You are the Honorary Chief of a regiment, and that is why you talk like this! Laughter). In the Communist Manifesto we were told that the proletariat should conquer the whole world. Now this could not be done with our bare hands (Laughter) this has to be done with bayonets and rifles. For this reason the spread of the system on which the Red Army is based is also the spread of socialism, the Proletarian might, of the Revolution. This gives the basis to the right of Red intervention under special circumstances which make the technical realisation of it possible.

Now I have done with the various problems, and I will now pass to a general survey of our problem, particularly the construction of the problem, and here I can afford to be quite brief. I mean to say that the programme of the national parties should consist at least of three parts:

1. a general part which is suitable for all parties. The general part of the programme should be printed in the membership book of every member in every country.
2. A national part, setting out the specific demands of the labour movement of the respective countries. And possibly also, 3. but this is really not a part of the programme—a programme of action which should deal with purely tactical questions, and which might be altered once every fortnight (laughter). Some comrades want us to define in our programme also the tactical questions, such as the capital levy in Germany, the tactics of the United Front, or even the question of the workers' government.

Comrade Varga said it would be mental cowardice to protest against it (Radek interposes, Quite right!) Nevertheless I maintain that the desire to settle these questions is nothing but the outcome of the opportunist proclivities of the respective comrades (Laughter). Such questions and slogans like the united front or the workers' Government, for instance, or the capital levy, are slogans that are based on very shifting ground. This basis consists of a certain depression within the labour movement. These comrades want to make this defensive position of the proletariat a plank on the programme, which would make it impossible to assume the offensive. Against such a proposition I will fight with all means at my disposal. We will never allow the adoption of such planks in our programme. (Radek, interposing: Who is the "we"?) We, that is all the best elements of the Communist International (Laughter and cheers).

Comrades, I think that in the theoretical part we should include the following sub-sections. First a general analysis of capitalism, which would be of particular importance to the colonial countries. Then we should have an analysis of imperialism and the decay of capitalism, and, further on, the analysis of the epoch of the social revolution.

In the second part of the programme we ought to have a sketch of the future communist society. I take it that a picture of the communist society in the programme would be necessary in order to show what communist really means and the difference between communism and the various transitory stages.

The third part should contain the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the struggle of the proletariat for power.

The fourth part should be devoted to general strategic questions, not such questions as the workers' government, but such basic questions as, for instance, the attitude towards social democracy and the trade unions.

Because these two questions are not of a fluctuating nature, the strategical and technical questions can be laid down in the programme.

With regard to the national part of the programme, it is not my task to touch upon these problems: for a special

investigation will have to be made according to the country and the programme.

Comrades, at this juncture I would like to offer a few more critical remarks regarding the expressions of opinion—some of them were made in writing—and articles by various comrades.

From the discussion on these questions we have the following documents and statements:

- 1) The Report of the first discussion of the Programme Commission, received by all the parties.
- 2) The answer of the Italian Central Committee to this report.
- 3) Some articles by comrade Varga.
- 4) An article by comrade Rudas.
- 5) An article by comrade Rappaport.
- 6) A draft by the German Party.
- 7) A draft by the Bulgarian Party, and.
- 8) My draft.

With regard to the first discussion by the programme commission, two standpoints were represented there. The differences were about the question whether we ought to include in our programme such tactical problems as the Workers' Government etc. or not. One of the standpoints I am representing here.

The Italian Central Committee gave its answer to the discussion of the Programme Commission in a letter in which they agreed to my view but for rather peculiar reasons. They said that these things could not be laid down in the programme because one could not force the credo out of the national parties. Thus the reason for our not being able to put these things in our programme is not that they are opportunistic but because the International cannot force the national Parties into a confession of faith. If that is so, we shall have to alter our programme every fortnight.

I am very grateful to the Italian comrades for agreeing to my views, but I cannot tender them the slightest thanks for their peculiar reasons for supporting me.

Now as to the articles by comrade Varga. Comrade Varga is a very brave fellow, and he therefore says that all those who refuse to accept his standpoint on this question are cowards. I have already said that his bravery is of an opportunistic nature, and our cowardice consists of refusing to be opportunists. We were afraid of being turned into opportunists.

Varga on his part is no coward and he therefore entertains no such fear. That is the real difference between him and ourselves.

Varga further wants us to include a description of the types of the various countries during the period of the collapse of capitalism. On the whole, he would have instead of a programme, an encyclopaedia of all the social sciences with all the supplements. Besides, I would consider it dangerous to incorporate a description of the types of all the countries upon our programme. The events may change very rapidly within the various countries. For instance, in the event of victorious revolution in Germany we would have immediately and completely to readjust our conception of the world situation as a whole. I therefore think it inexpedient to include a concrete description of the types of different countries. Besides the reason that it would be inexpedient on account of possible political changes, this would also make our programme far too long and cumbersome for any worker to read.

With regard to the article by comrade Smeral, I can distinguish two distinct lines of direction in which he expresses his wishes. On the one hand he wants us to make full use of the experiences of the Russian Revolution and he justly wants us to include the question of the relation between the different branches of industry and the different social strata. Yet on the other hand, together with Varga and Radek he wants us to fix on the programme such questions as the Workers' Government, the open letter etc.

With the article of comrade Rudas I am on the whole, in agreement.

With regard to the article by comrade Rappaport, I have tried in vain to find any tangible idea in it.

With regard to the programme by the German Party, I would say that in my opinion it possesses the following defects.

1. It is pedantic.
2. It is drawn in too concrete detail.

For instance, it contains a long passage about various concrete things like the Peace of Versailles etc., etc., which in my opinion do not at all belong to the programme. This descriptive and concrete historical side of the German draft accounts also for its great length. It is not

a programme, but a very extensive universal manifesto. This is the impression I gained from the draft. Many passages are written in brilliant style and are quite good theoretically.

3. The draft is altogether too European—the German comrades admitted that them too German i. d., based too much on the standpoint of Central Europe.

4. The final defect of the German programme consists in that it summarises all the other programmes, which makes it unduly long. It does not contain a general analysis of capital, which is important; it does not contain a general description of communism, which is also necessary; and above all it is too long, far too long.

With regard to the Bulgarian programme, I have the following to say: it contains some passages which are likewise too concretely drawn, and far too long for the purposes of a programme; they could only serve as commentaries.

Then the construction of the programme is not quite a happy one, for it contains a certain mixture of Bulgarian and general questions. I have a material remark to make with regard to a certain passage, in which the Bulgarian comrades speak of the role of the Party. In the concluding words of that passage they speak even of armed insurrection. They speak of mass actions and strikes leading to armed revolt; this is very revolutionary. But in speaking of the role of the party generally, this programme, in my opinion, lays too much stress on parliamentary activity. The proportion between the activity out of parliament and within is not quite a happy one, even if you would only take into consideration the corresponding dimensions of the paper devoted to them. I think it will be much better if we correct somewhat this part of the programme.

One other remark in conclusion. If the demands of the Party as elaborated in the Bulgarian programme, are intended for all parties affiliated with the International, then it is too much. If they are intended only for the Balkan countries, then they lack those demands which would be proper for the International. Also in this respect I think some correction would be necessary.

Of course I do not urge you to accept my offer (Laughter and applause). Nevertheless I would ask the comrades to discuss these questions, and particularly, after the Congress, to elaborate theoretically and in larger scope the many component parts of the programme.

I conclude my lengthy report with the hope that we will emerge from the Fifth Congress with an effective, truly revolutionary orthodox Marxian programme. (Prolonged cheers).

Chairman:—Comrade Thalheimer has the floor.

Thalheimer:—Comrades, you have four programmes before you: that of comrade Bukharin, a Bulgarian programme, a German programme, and finally the programme of action of the Italian Party. I have not come here to praise the German programme above all others. It is only a first draft which has to be improved and enlarged both in form and content. But this is true for all programmes: the German programme is no exception. As they stand now, all these drafts are only a basis for a final programme and for international discussion. The final programme I believe can only be the product of the collective work of all. I agree completely with Comrade Bukharin that the final programme may be decided upon only at the next Congress. Today we can only prepare and introduce the work, therefore, it is necessary to bring out clearly the differences which exist between the various programmes; this will constitute the main part of my speech. I do not wish to repeat Comrade Bukharin's excellent speech to prove the theoretical bankruptcy of the Second and Second and a Half Internationals; I only wish to bring out a few typical examples.

First of all I would like to point out that in his programme, Kautsky rejects even the fundamentals of the Marxian conception of capitalist economics. For instance one of our basic conceptions is that the regulating law of capitalism is the production of surplus value. Suddenly, Kautsky discovers that capitalism is based upon the needs of consumption. There could be no more absolute, no more fundamental capitulation to capitalist economics than this.

I would also like to say a few words on the proposals of the reformists which

Kautsky regards as a way to a Socialist regime. Comrade Bukharin was quite right when he said that we did not disagree with Kautsky only on the question of a tempo of transformation from capitalism to socialism, but that our basis difference is this: we believe that this transformation first begins after the conquest of power by the proletariat while he says that this may take place before and without the conquest of political power.

To-day, Kautsky totally agrees with Bernstein on all these points. He has accepted all Bernsteins reformistic proposals and declares them to be the true Marxism. I will not discuss these things any longer theoretically, but practically. What is the purpose of these proposals. They go along the well known paths of Municipalisation, and secondly of Guild Socialism, a new importation. To prove his new theories a la Bernstein, Kautsky who is usually a very sober thinker writes the most fantastic nonsense. For instance, take Guild Socialism. The Guild Socialists believe that, without the conquest of political power, the Trade Unions may introduce Socialism step by step, so to speak behind the back of capitalism. One need only look at the Trade Unions and realise their financial situation in the disruption of capitalism to see that this is a pure phantasy. At a time when the Trade Unions had the greatest difficulty in gathering strike funds, who can expect them to introduce socialist economy behind the back of capitalism.

Another favorite hobby-horse of the reformists is Municipal Socialism, Municipalisation. Anyone, who has any knowledge of the situation in the West knows that the most striking characteristic of the Western countries is the bankruptcy not only of the State, but also the municipalities; and that this is the problem of to-day for the municipalities: not the transformation to Socialism, but the defence against the attacks of capitalism who wish to gain control of the municipal industries.

A third point. To render the transformation more easy it has been proposed to take over capitalist property, and pay compensation. You all know that Karl Marx has said that eventually the

English Landowners would be bought out. But he did not mean this in the sense that this could take place before the conquest of Power, but only after the proletariat had captured political power. What is the situation in the greater part of Europe. Let us suppose that we have captured political power, that the question before us is the expropriation of the capitalists. Everyone knows that the first requisite for the reconstruction of the Socialist Society is the liquidation of the tremendous weight of debts which weighs upon industry. This mild method of buying out the capitalists is just as much a Utopia as Kautsky's idea of Guild Socialism or Municipalisation.

I would like to point out another beautiful point of Kautsky's theories, namely, the problem of the State bureaucracy and that of State capitalism or State Socialism. According to Kautsky there are only two States in which the bureaucracy plays a great role. The first is France, the 'Republic without republicans'. The second, says Kautsky, is Soviet Russia. Apparently, democracy has been introduced in Germany to the extent that the State bureaucracy has disappeared. As a result, in Germany and in the other bourgeois democratic States, the Social Democrats have nothing to do with the Democratic bureaucracy. But we know that the whole question of social democratic politics is limited to introducing Social Democratic officials in place of bourgeois officials.

In his treatise on State Socialism and State Capitalism, Kautsky suddenly discovers that the State bureaucracy exists still, and, what is more, is quite incapable of managing the capitalist enterprises. The bureaucracy is conservative, and is rigid, only the capitalists themselves can manage these industries.

What does this mean in Germany today? It means the direct coalition, the cooperation with Stinnes and his like, who will be charged with one socialisation. Kautsky has already given his theoretical blessing to, and justification of the Second and the Second and a Half Internationals, of the U.S.P. and S.P.D. in Germany. Should a Stinnes Government be now created in Germany with the cooperation of the social-democrats, a Stinnes Govern-

ment, which will seek to place in capitalist hands those industries which are still socialised, it would have Kautsky's blessing.

I only wish to speak of these points because it characteristically shows the theoretical capitulation of the Second and a Half Internationals.

I would also like to add something to what Comrade Bukarin said on the Marxian decadence and its disruption.

This is what I would like to say in this connection: Our conflict with the Marxists of the Second International already began after the first Russian Revolution. The first conflict was over the general strike; since then this conflict has widened. The main conflict was the theoretical debate on the causes of imperialism, and in connection with it, the political question of Disarmament. The first theoretical battles in Germany were fought around this point; and here was laid the foundation of the division into the Marxian centre, including the U. S. P. D. and now the V. S. P. D. on the one side and the K.P.D. on the other.

A few more remarks to bring out more clearly what Bukarin said on the theoretical capitulation especially as it appeared in the programmes of the Second and Second and a Half Internationals, and the Gurlitzer programme. All that Bukharin has emphasised and argued here as if he were lecturing to a class of boys, the dismissal of the impoverishment theory, of the crisis theory etc. all this has appeared clearly in the commentaries on the Gurlitzer programme.

Kampffmeier, Bernstein, Stapfer, have shown clearly this capitulation.

Now with regard to debateable questions, I will deal with the following:

1) The basic section, the theoretical explanation of imperialism in connection with the theory of accumulation.

2) The question of temporary measures of partial demands before the conquest of power, which I consider as the main question for the preparation of a general programme, as well as the programmes of the individual parties.

3) A few brief remarks on economic measures after the conquest of power, war communism, and N. E. P.

4) The form and construction of the programme.

I will speak at once on the first point, the theoretical explanation on imperialism. I do not wish to begin here a theoretical debate. All I wish to do is to present the question clearly as an introduction to the theoretical discussion which I believe necessary. It is clear that we can reach a decision in such question only after a thorough discussion in our press and in our pamphlets. What I wish to do is to make the question clear, and bring out its importance for our theories and our programme. I have already said that the differences in theory and tactics in the old social democracy of Germany originated from this theoretical consideration of Imperialism. There were two main questions which entered here: first, the more important: is Imperialism an inevitable phase of imperialist development? The second question is a theoretical explanation of this inevitability of imperialist development. In Germany, this was the main question which separated the Left from the Centre Marxists. The main point around which the whole debate turned is this: Imperialism is an economic problem of accumulation, of capital growth or enlarged production. This enlarged production, this capital growth, this spread of capital into non-capitalist territories is an historical fact, which does not commence with the appearance of capitalism. From the beginning of Capitalism, began also Colonial wars, colonial conquests, trade wars, etc.

When we say imperialism, we do not mean only this colonial expansion of the capitalist States, but the special form of expansion under the present imperialist conditions. Comrade Luxemburg formulated this special form of expansion, the special conditions of capitalist expansion in the period of imperialism as follows:

"In the Imperialist era, we are confronted with a struggle for the resto of the non-capitalist territory, for its new division, and finally, in connection with this, with the expansion of the capitalist and political basis of power".

These facts have been known for a long time and cannot be contradicted. The question is an explanation of these facts:

Is the imperialist era with its catastrophes and crises an historical accident or a necessity? Here comes in the political question: Is it possible to go back from this imperialist era, to the Manchester period, into the period of liberal capitalism, free Trade, peace, pacifism, or is there only one way out, namely the revolutionary conquest of the imperialist era; is Socialism the only way out? On the solution of this question depends also our political tactics.

If we assume that imperialism represents the interests of only a section of the bourgeoisie, that the interests of the whole of the bourgeoisie are represented by the Manchester method, what follows therefrom for our tactics? There follows the possibility that we might unite with one part of the bourgeoisie against the other. Here is laid the theoretical foundation for the coalition policy. The opposite view naturally would lead to an opposite policy.

Theoretically the question presents itself in the following manner:—Is the unlimited expansion of capital, accumulation, possible within the bounds of capitalism, or does this accumulation find other limits than capitalism itself? That, simply formulated, is: Can capitalism expand without limit, or are there certain necessary theoretical bounds to this growth? Some people have objected to this theory of accumulation that it is a sort of fatalism, according to which capitalism reaches a point when it breaks down mechanically. This point at which capitalism no longer finds any field for expansion and must break down mechanically, is an abstract limit, a limit in the mathematical sense. What it actually means is something different. It means that capitalism is forced into an imperialist phase which sharpens the class antagonism, that it is forced into the most severe political and social catastrophes. It follows therefrom that it is not this limit which will determine the end of capitalism, but the severe crises into which imperialism leads it.

She then states further:

In proportion as capital assisted by militarism extends this power abroad doing away at the same time with noncapitalistic strata and lowering the living conditions of the toiling masses at home,

in that proportion does the daily history of capitalist accumulation become the history of political economic crises, render eventually impossible all further accumulation, and bring upon the stage of world history the rebellion of the International working class against the rule of capital as a historical necessity, this process setting in long before capitalist accumulation has reached its own natural limits.

This is one side of the question. And now, Comrades, let us examine for a moment the opposite position occupied by the staunchest opponents of this theory. Hilferding dealing with the Marxian theory in his book "Financial Capital" says that capitalism has in it the possibilities of unlimited expansion. As to Bauer—not to miss the Austrian head of the school—he has advanced a remarkable theory, namely, that capitalist development is conditioned and regulated by the increase of the population, namely of the working class population. This means turning upside down the Marxian theory of population, which says exactly the opposite.

Let me now give you some illustration of the political consequences of such a conception. In this connection it should be stated, that there are many who though denying the accumulation theory, have not reached these political conclusions from it. This does not prove their argument but merely shows their lack of consistency.

In order to prove this I find it necessary to quote the remarks of Comrade Luxemburg. The following is from her work directed against the criticisms of the accumulation theory.

"Accumulation is impossible in a purely capitalist milieu. This is why from the first beginnings of capitalist development, it exhibits the following tendencies: expansion of capital to non-capitalist strata and countries the ruin of artisans and peasantry, the proletarianisation of the middle class, colonial policy, capitalist penetration and the export of capital. The existence and further development of capitalism is possible only by continual expansion of capital to new domains of production and new countries. But this expansion, in the course of its world-wide

development, leads necessarily to a conflict between capitalistic and pre-capitalistic forms of society. This gives rise to violence, war, revolution, in short, to continual chaos, which has been the distinguishing feature of capitalism from beginning to end".

Comrade Luxemburg then goes on to inquire whether the objective limits of capitalism must necessarily be reached and whether capitalism can actually reach that point, and her answer is as follows:

"This is, after all, only a theoretical fiction, for accumulation of capital is not merely an economic but also a political process.

Imperialism is just as much a historical factor, necessary to the existence of capital, as it is the most certain means of securing a final end to it by the shortest route.

This does not mean that this end will be reached according to set dogma. The very tendency of capitalism to move in this direction expresses itself in such forms as lend to the period of capitalism a catastrophic character".

(The accumulation of Capital, P. 425)

First of all these are the views of Kautsky in his writings from 1912 until 1922. On April 26th, 1922 Kautsky writes in the "Neue Zeit".

"Competition in armaments rests upon economic causes, but not on economic necessity"—A particularly fine piece of scholastic sophistry—"and its cessation is by no means an economic impossibility".

There you have the theoretical key to the position assumed by the Independents and by Kautsky during the war.

Bernstein spoke in a similar strain at the Party National Convention at Chemnitz in 1912. It is very interesting to find that these two opposite poles met on this point already as early as 1912. Bernstein said:

"I could say much in answer to the charge that what we demand here, namely, disarmament, is utopian and reactionary. It is not so... The world development has often taken a false path". This reminds me of the little anecdote about the officer who saw a dove flying and said: "Look, that dove is flying". We wish to know for certain all that is meant by

"Peace on earth and good will to all men". In this good-will idea, Kautsky and Bernstein found themselves in accord already in 1912.

And here we have a small quotation from an article which Hilferding wrote in November-December, 1916 entitled "The Catastrophy Theory; Reciprocity and Dominion as Methods of Commercial Policy".

"While capitalism would remain possible even when the whole world was almost equally developed capitalistically, imperialism presupposes the existence of many economic variations". And further: "The working class can advocate only the policy of commercial reciprocity".

Then again:

"Free trade by its opposition to imperialistic commercial policy and, consequently, to imperialism generally, is a weapon which the working class cannot afford to neglect".

And still further:

"From this standpoint capitalist colonial policy loses its importance. It is of no consequence then to whom the colonies politically belong. The development of the British colonial Empire has been economically beneficial to all other peoples having spared them the burden of acquisition and development".

What is behind all this? It is the idea of which we have previously spoken, the idea that it is possible to direct imperialism backwards to free trade and its theoretical consequences. The toiling masses must not struggle forward towards socialism, but backward, allying themselves with the corresponding sections of the bourgeoisie following the same course. The fullest fruition of this theory was reached in an article by Hilferding, in the beginning of 1922, in which he claims that the period of imperialistic antagonisms have come to an end, and that now the era of imperialistic harmony was beginning. This is in accord with the view point advanced by Hilferding already in 1912.

In the article just referred to:

"Capitalist economy has two methods of increasing profits: competition and co-operation. At every forward step of Capitalism, co-operation takes the place of competition. This also applies to the Internatio-

nal policies of capitalist States... The last war has left behind two principal centres of power. It has also shown how destructive the war was. In order to be successful, therefore, a change in capitalist methods is necessary, namely, cooperation instead of competition".

So that cooperation on the part of the capitalists is the advice which Hilferding, on the grounds of his analysis, offered in 1922.

Comrades, this theoretical analysis of imperialism has been advanced not only in Germany but also in Russia. I wish especially to draw the attention of our Russian comrades to this. It was the so-called legal Marxism of Tugan-Baranowsky, Struvo and Bulgakoff which advocated the theory of the unlimited expansion of capitalism. I wish to deal briefly with the foundation of this theory. It was the concern of the newly introduced Marxism in Russia to prove in opposition to the Narodniki, that capitalist development in Russia was both possible and necessary. Now, these Marxians did prove this, but they proved it a little too much. (Interruption: Lenin too!) Yes, Lenin too. They proved that capital was limitless and eternal, and incidently they introduced the theoretical implication that socialism was impossible. This, comrades, is analogous with the case of Germany. Tugan Baranowsky, Struve and Bulgakov all landed in the camp of the bourgeoisie. There are similar instances but, as I have said, they rest upon theoretical inconsistency.

I have dealt with this question so thoroughly because it is not a matter of incidental importance, but concerns our main theory. This criticism of the theory which was advanced in Germany, and also has been, in my opinion, disproved; and those comrades who are opposed to this theory—and this refers also to a large number of Russian comrades—have the subject cleared up in their own minds.

I now come to the point relating to the general program and the programs of the individual parties upon which I stand in sharpest opposition to Comrade Bukharin, namely, the question of the demands of the minimum program. Comrade Bukharin takes the position that one must separate the transitory or immediate demands from

the program proper. He assigns them to a separate room, on the door of which he affixes the inscription, "program of Action". Here, one may commit all kinds of iniquities. (Bukharin, interrupting: But admission is free!) Free admission is alright. Then let us open the door and see what things programmatically admissible we are going to find there. (Inter-ruption: What do you consider admissible things?) That is just the point. We had opposition in Germany to the inclusion of the transitional demand for the conquest of power in the program. In this, some have seen, as Comrade Bukharin has, a certain danger of opportunism. We must therefore very carefully examine the question as to how far it is possible to separate the tactical principles from our general principles and aims. I am of the opinion that those who see any guarantee in this division of tactics, principles and aims are in great error, and are exposing us to just those dangers that certain of these which they seek to avoid will be neglected. (Hear, hear!) One need only look at the history of the Second International and its decay to realise that it was precisely this division of the tactical clauses of the program from the ultimate aim which accelerated its deterioration into opportunism. How did this process start in Germany? With the Bernstein-Kautsky debates on tactics. The final goal remained. And to-day when we wish to emphasise the difference between communists and social reformists we say: We differ in our final aims; we want socialism and communism, while they do not want it. How do we prove this statement? By pointing to the tactics, the road which these people followed and which are quite different from ours. That is the principal point. I claim therefore that specific difference between us and the reformist socialists lies not in the fact that we keep our immediate aims to a separate compartment, apart from our program but in the fact that we bring our immediate aims and preliminary demands into the closest relationship with our principles and final aims.

This relationship does not of course, of itself, insure that I have found the right path when I have the right map. I do not even know how to read the map. And it seems to me that what Comrade

Lenin said in regard to Russia—Russia must concern itself mainly with the elementary task of reading and writing—is also true in another sense for the Communist Parties of the West. They must learn to read the truth. Therefore, the danger of opportunism lies directly upon the opposite side, our starting point forward to socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

By leaving long stretches of this path in the dark many errors might be committed. I was particularly interested in what Bukharin said about the written statements of the Italian Communist Party in which that Party expresses opposition to transition demands, because one must not make a credo of them.

There is a number of such transitional demands and measures which most become a credo, and which we must insist on our various parties accepting.

Comrades, the question of these transitional demands and the minimum program is not new. This question was already fought out once even on Russian ground, and I think that it will be of interest to read the documents bearing on it. It was in the autumn of 1917 that the question of the Russian Party program was discussed. The question arose then, should the Russian Party, which was on the eve of assuming power retain only the maximum program and eliminate the minimum program. I believe that it will be as well to quote comrade Lenin's statement in this connection. Comrade Lenin said then—you will excuse me if the question is rather long:—"Our entire program would be nothing but a scrap of paper if it were not to serve us in all eventualities and in all the phases of the struggle by its application, and not by its non-application. If our program is the formulation of the historic development of society from capitalism to socialism, it must naturally also formulate all the transition phases of this development, and must be able to explain to the proletariat at any time the process of the transition towards socialism. Hence, it follows that the proletariat must not be put in such a position where it would be forced even for a single moment to abandon its program or be itself abandoned by it.

This finds its practical expression in the fact that there is not a single mo-

ment in which the proletariat having by force of circumstances assumed the power should not be obliged to take some measures for the realisation of its program, which would be in the nature of transition measures of a socialist nature. Behind the assertion that the socialist program may during some phase of the political domination of the proletariat, fail to give any directions for its realisation, colours unconsciously the other assertion; that the socialist program in general can never be realised.

From the general or fundamental part of the program, we shall now go over to the program.

Here we find at once the outwardly "very radical" and perfectly unsatisfactory proposal of Comrades Bukharin and Smirnov to do away entirely with the minimum program as supposed to be "obsolete" and unnecessary, as it was a question of the transition measures towards socialism.

Such is the proposal of both these comrades who, however, for some reason or other could not make up their minds to bring forward a suitable program (although the tasks and the agenda of the next Party Conference which provide for the revision of the party program made it incumbent on these comrades to draw up such a proposal).

It is just possible that the authors of the seemingly "radical" proposal itself have become somewhat undecided... Be it as it may, their point of view must be examined.

Owing to the war and the economic deterioration, all the countries are compelled to go over from monopolist capitalism to monopolist State capitalism. Such is the situation. But monopolistic State capitalism in a revolutionary epoch develops directly into socialism. One cannot go forward in a revolution without marching toward socialism. Such is the objective situation created by the war and by the revolution. Our April Conference confirmed this by issuing the watchwords of the "Soviet Republic" (the political form of the dictatorship of the proletariat) and of the nationalisation of the banks and trusts as the fundamental measures for the transition to socialism. Up to this point all the Bolsheviks are agreed. However, Comrades V. Smirnov

and N. Bukharin want to go further by rejecting the minimum program. This would be tantamount to acting contrary to the wise counsel of the wise proverb which says: "Do not boast when you go into battle, but wait till you return from battle." Brandler: Hear, hear, laughter).

We are going into the battle, i.e., we are struggling for the conquest of the political power by means of our Party. This power would be a dictatorship of the proletariat and of the poor peasantry. When we assume this power, we are not only not afraid to go beyond the limits of the bourgeois order, but we declare, on the contrary, quite openly and precisely that we will go beyond these limits, that we will march fearlessly towards socialism and that our way towards it leads via the Soviet Republic, the nationalisation of the banks and trusts, workers' control, obligatory labour, the nationalisation of the land, confiscation of the big estates, etc., etc. It is in this sense that we formulated a program of transition measures towards socialism.

But we must not drag while going to battle. We must not eliminate the minimum program, for this would be tantamount to bragging. (Hear, hear.) We do not want "to demand anything from the bourgeoisie, but we must create everything ourselves, and our work must not be a tinkering within the limits of the bourgeois order."

Such an attitude would be nothing but empty bragging, for first of all, one must conquer power, and we have not yet done that. In the first instance we must put the transition measures towards socialism into practice and we must lead our revolution to the final victory of the international socialist revolution. It is only "when the battle is won" that one can put aside the minimum program as useless.

Can we vouch for it that it is not very necessary now? Of course not, for the simple reason that we have not yet conquered power, not introduced socialism; we have not yet even reached the beginning of the socialist world revolution.

We must march towards this aim boldly and without any hesitation, but it is ridiculous to declare that we have already reached it, as everyone knows that we have not yet done so. The elimination of

the minimum program is tantamount to a declaration, an announcement (or rather a boast) "that we have already conquered." No, dear comrades, we have not yet conquered.

I shall now give you yet another quotation which will be useful for our further discussion of the program. Comrade Lenin continues:

We do not know if we will be victorious tomorrow or a little later. I, personally am inclined to think that it will be tomorrow, (I am writing this in October 5, 1917), and that we might be too late in taking over the power. However, tomorrow is tomorrow, and not to-day. We do not know how soon after our victory the revolution will come in the West. We do not know if after our victory there will not be periods of reaction and of counter-revolutionary victories. There is nothing impossible in that. Therefore, we shall after our victory construct "a triple line of trenches" against such an eventuality.

As yet we do not know and we cannot know anything about this. No one can know it, and therefore it is ridiculous to throw out the minimum program, which is very much needed as long as we are still living within the bourgeois order, as long as we have not destroyed this order, have not laid the foundation for the transition to socialism, have not beaten the bourgeoisie and having beaten it, have not totally destroyed it. All this will come and will probably come much sooner than some of us expect. I am myself of the opinion that it will begin tomorrow, but tomorrow is not yet with us.

Let us deal with the minimum program on the political field. It is intended for the bourgeois republic. We add that we do not confine ourselves to its limits, but that we begin at once to struggle for the higher type—the Soviet Republic. We must do this. We must march towards the new republic with boldness and determination, and I am convinced that we will do so. However, the minimum program must not be thrown out on any account, for the Soviet Republic is not yet with us. Moreover, the possibility of "attempts at restoration" are not excluded and we must go through it and remove it. It is also possible that during the

transition from the old to the new "combined types" of government will make their appearance as pointed out in the "Rabochi Put" a few days ago; for instance the Soviet Republic as well as the constituent Assembly. All this must be outlived and then there will be ample time to throw out the minimum program.

And in conclusion, there is the following statement:

"The same is the case on the economic field. We are all agreed that the fear of march towards socialism is tantamount to ignominious betrayal of the interests of the proletariat. We are also all of us agreed that the first steps in this direction must be measures such as the nationalisation of banks and trusts. Let us first of all bring into being these and similar measures, and then we can consider further steps, for experience will have broadened our outlook. Practical experience is worth a million times more than the best programs. It is quite possible and even probable that even here we shall not be able to do without "combined types" for the transition period. For instance, we cannot at once nationalise the small industrial concerns, employing a few workers, neither can we put them under a real workers' control. These concerns may be tied hand and foot through the nationalisation of the banks and trusts, but there is no reason for throwing out the minimum program, as long as there are even small relics of bourgeois conditions. As Marxists, who enter boldly into the greatest world revolution and yet take a sane view of facts, we have no right to throw out the minimum program.

If we were to throw it out now, we should only prove that we have lost our heads even before we could achieve victory. But we must not lose our heads, neither before nor during nor after the victory, for if we lose our heads, we shall lose all."

Comrades, thus wrote Lenin on October 6th 1917 at a time when he could say: "the proletarian dictatorship, our victory, is a thing of tomorrow, but we are not yet there, it is still to-day with us." Comrades, looking at it on a world scale, we are certainly justified in saying that the victory of the world revolution is not a matter of to-day. Perhaps, it is not

even matter of tomorrow, at least not in the sense as this was said in 1917. If we consider things on a world scale, we are obliged to say that the interval between the present state and the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship on a world scale must be measured by years, and perhaps even by decades, at least if we include in addition to the big capitalist countries also the colonial and semicolonial countries. For the enormous field which lies before us we must lay out exact land marks and I am asking myself what kind of land marks and fundamental rules we should have. Comrade Bukharin's chief objection consisted in the assertion that we cannot include concrete everyday demands in the general program, because the latter are only temporary and might change every month or every week. He also said that these concrete everyday demands vary in the various countries, and that we cannot therefore bring them under one heading. My answer to this is: we need not bring into the general program nor into any national programs the concrete everyday demands in all their details, but we must give the fundamental tactical rules, the tactical principles and the methods (if you will allow me to say so) from which all these concrete separate demands may be unmistakably drawn.

And, comrades, there are not only such problems of the transition period which are different in the different countries and which may change from week to week and from month to month, but there is also a number of questions of great significance for the transition period which must absolutely be put in the Communist program. And I wish to say that a general program of the Communist International, which would be a blank on these questions, would be of very little practical worth for the Parties of Western Europe (German delegates: Hear, hear!). It is just at this juncture that great importance should be attached to the transition period. I would like to mention certain questions which arise in this connection, and which, in my opinion, must beyond all doubt be included in a Communist Program. There is the question of the control of production, of State capitalism and of a general outline of tax-

tion and financial policy for the various Parties (Hear, hear!). The Parties may be confronted with these questions almost any day. Their concrete forms change (Bukharin: that's it). Yes, but one must have a general outline from which to draw practical conclusions. Let us take the Erfurt Program for example. It contained the groundwork of a taxation policy which, of course, is now out of date. You will certainly not deny, Comrade Bukharin, that the financial situation in various countries including Germany, were very different at different periods; yet such a general guiding principle is most useful and important.

Comrades, a second important matter relating to the transition period is our relation to bourgeois democracy. I find in the program submitted by Comrade Bukharin an admirable critical analysis of bourgeois democracy, but do you regard the Communist International as a solid whole, so that it suffices for all its Parties, let us say from India to Soviet Russia: (Bukharin: No! Not by a long way!) First we must have a guide as to the relations of the Communists to the democrats in those countries where bourgeois democracy has not yet been established that is to say where the struggle must still be against absolutist and feudal forms of the State. Secondly, we must have some direction for the policy of the communists in such a situation as that in Germany, in connection with the defence of the republic against monarchist attacks. And, thirdly, we must have some guidance for the communists in a situation similar to that which prevailed in Germany in November 1918, when there was an opportunity of breaking up the democracy and establishing a dictatorship. I repeat that all these transitional phases must be dealt with in their general fundamentals, not in detail. And that this is quite possible, is proven by the Communist Manifesto of 1848. Take, for example the last chapter which deals with the relation of communists to other parties, to bourgeois democracy, to the petty-bourgeoisie, etc. In a few pithy sentences the path is indicated. The same thing must be done in our program. A program—and here I make use of a remark of Comrade Luxemburg which seems to be most appropriate—must furnish a handle

which may be grasped at in any essential transitional phase. A program which leaves us in the lurch during such phases, or which we can apply in some cases and cannot be applied in others has but little political value. I also find that Comrade Bukharin has not been quite consistent. If he really wishes to follow up in all consistency his denial of the transitional demands, he should oppose with all vehemence the Bulgarian program as well as the German program. It is quite obvious that he must do this.

I now leave this question and turn to that of the transitional demands, war communism, and the new economic policy in their relationship to the peoples of Western Europe. Here I wish to agree with all that Comrade Bukharin has said, but would like to add a few explanations.

It has been quite rightly said here that war communism, as also the new economic policy are not the products of a definite scheme, but were produced by iron necessity. These necessities were due to causes which are not of a specifically Russian but of a general nature. The question is how shall we apply these things to Western Europe.

Comrade Trotzky has well pointed out—as has also Comrade Bukharin—that the necessities of civil war are frequently in contradiction to economic necessities. War communism is mainly a produce of civil war. We in Western Europe will also have to go through a period of civil war, after the conquest of power, although it may be foretold that this period will be much shorter than in Russia, and so war communism may not play such an important role with us. We cannot, of course, foresee these things in detail. But we may be sure that, during the civil war, we shall have to subordinate economic necessity to war necessity.

Now, with regard to the NEP in the West. The needs of the small peasantry exist in the West also, even if not to such a great degree. Many say that in Russia these conditions necessitated a special economic policy; while in Germany they will also produce a different economic policy. One forgets that in the period when this question will confront us Germans, we shall not have to deal with an

isolated Germany, but probably with a German-Russian economic alliance. What would this mean? It would mean that these great masses of the Russian small bourgeoisie will inject their interests into the German economic field, and that there will be a strengthening of the industrial factor in Russian economic life.

So far as we can see, this policy signifies a forward step for Russia, but it is probably a step backward for the West.

Comrades, the great importance of the economic policy for the Parties of the West depends upon the definition in our program of our relationship to the middle sections of society, the small peasants, the small tradesmen and craftsmen, etc. I do not mean that we should now construct a fixed policy, as there is no immediate economic necessity. We should, however, include in the program that considerations of indulgency with regard to these classes will have to be swept aside by the necessities of civil war.

And now a few remarks with regard to the Bulgarian program.

In our program and in the Bulgarian program we have placed the demand about the formation of cooperatives of small tradesmen and petty manufacturers after the seizure of power. I would like to point out that in industry these cooperatives will play a different role from that of the agricultural. Let us imagine a country like Germany with a developed industry. Here the time will soon come when we will wish to absorb these small industrial enterprises in our large scale industry. Here the cooperative methods will have to extend for a longer time and the cooperatives themselves will be of a different character from the industrial cooperatives.

I now come finally to the construction of the program. I would like to remark here that on the whole, one can agree with Comrade Bukharin's proposals. We have ceased analysing the capitalist system in our program. We have begun to analyse its imperialist stage. We have come to the conclusion that this analysis is necessary and must be undertaken.

I believe that it will be necessary to consider the proposition of Comrade Varga and also to return to preface our pro-

gram by an analysis of the pre-capitalistic methods of exploitation. If we really want an international communist program, we shall have to do this.

And now finally the form of the program. Comrade Bukharin complained the length of the program. Comrades, we also are not pleased with this length, but we are in the same position as the French Bishop who wrote to his friend: "I am writing you a long letter because I have no time to write a short one." We have had no time to discuss a short program. It is absolutely necessary that the program should be short, perhaps even shorter than that of Comrade Bukharin. I recall in this connection what Engels said on the program question: He said that a program must be as short as possible, and must leave much to verbal elaboration. It should also, of course, be as simple as possible. And we also admit that the German program needs improvement.

Comrades, in conclusion I wish to emphasize that we must make our Communist program invulnerable. But we cannot hope for this if we leave a long stretch of our revolutionary path unilluminated, or, to use another term, if we

omit a substantial portion of our road from our chart.

Comrade Bukharin and several other comrades, fear that, if they dwell upon this part of the road, we shall be unable to leap over it. Now comrades, I would draw your attention to the example of our Russian comrades who, on October 6, 1917, formulated their minimum program but were able to take this leap very quickly, I am convinced that it does not depend upon the omission of these demands whether we should have a program which would lead us to victory (Loud applause).

Kolaroff: Before we proceed to the translation of the report we must decide whether we shall hold another session to-day. The Presidium is of the opinion that we must be finished with the discussion of this question by this evening. Otherwise, the whole schedule of the Congress will have to be altered.

Therefore the Presidium proposes that we hold a second session this evening at 7 o'clock.

Is there any opposition?... The proposal is accepted.

(The session adjourned at 4.10 p.m.)

Fifteenth Session.

November 18th, (Evening).

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Contents:

Discussion on Report of the program of the Communist International (continued).

Speaker: Comrade Kabatcheief.

(The meeting was opened at 7.30 p.m.)

Kolaroff: The meeting is opened. Comrade Kabatcheief has the floor as third speaker on the question.

Kabatcheief: Comrades, the Communist International is faced with the important task of creating its program and the program of the more important national sections. What circumstances have forced this task upon the Comintern?

The Necessity for a Communist Program.

The Second International is bankrupt. The period of peaceful development and growing prosperity of capitalism from 1871 to the beginning of the imperialist era, that is to the beginning of the 20th century, has created and strengthened the opportunistic tendencies of the Second International and left its impression on the program of the social democratic parties. The chief characteristics of the social democratic parties are the adaptation of the working class to capitalism, its acceptance of the capitalist system and the postponement of socialism for an indefinite time.

This is why the social democratic parties have given so much attention to a minimum program, i.e., to demands realisable within the limits and on the basis of capitalist society; they have lost sight of the final aims: the conquest of political power by the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The New Revolutionary Era.

But the birth of imperialism and the imperialist wars which, beginning at the

periphery of the capitalist world, finally drew all the large capitalist powers into the world war, and the Russian Revolution of 1905, followed by the revolutions in Turkey, China, Persia, etc. have brought this peaceful period of capitalism to an end and ushered in the new period of wars and revolutions. During this period the whole capitalist world is affected by a general economic and political crisis. The revolutionary movement of the proletariat has gained in strength and scope. Imperialism, the war, and the crisis, have sharpened the class antagonism and given life to the class war.

The conscious and revolutionary elements of the proletariat have left the social democratic party and have created the international solidarity of the revolutionary proletariat by their fight against opportunism and their rupture with bourgeois nationalism.

Thus were created the conditions for the birth of the Communist International which was finally created in 1919 in Moscow.

The revolutionary communist movement of the working class is characterised by the new methods of struggle: it is the struggle for the conquest of political power by mass actions, by general strikes, by armed insurrection. The minimum program has ceased to be the centre of the proletarian struggle; the revolutionary struggle for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship is now their goal.

The Experience of the Russian Revolution.

Naturally, the Communist Parties can not make use of the old program of the

social democratic parties. The Paris Commune, the first attempt of the proletariat to conquer political power, gave Marx his basis to enounce clearly the aims and means of the proletarian revolution, or the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The Russian Revolution, which put political power into the hands of the proletariat of the largest country in the world, and which exists already for five years, is of much greater historical importance; it has shown to the proletariat of the world the forms and means of the proletarian dictatorship. The Russian Revolution must therefore serve the International and its affiliated sections as the most important example by which to determine the forms and aims of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as well as the means to conquer power. We must therefore go back to the Russian Revolution for our source from which to elaborate the program of the Communist International and of its national sections.

At its first Congress the Comintern stated its principles; at its Second Congress, it enounced the basis of its organization; at the Third Congress it settled the general policy of the Communist International; in the present period it is therefore time to elaborate the program of the Communist International and its sections. If the Fourth Congress cannot accomplish this task, it must at least announce the basis upon which the sections of the Comintern must work during the coming year to attain the final program at the next Congress.

The Program of the Communist Party of Bulgaria.

The draft which the Communist Party of Bulgaria presented to the Congress is constructed on the following lines: the program is divided into two parts; the first one contains a general statement of principles, the theoretical foundation for the program; the second enumerates our concrete aims and demands for which our party is fighting, i. e., the program proper. The theoretical part is subdivided into four parts:

1) A brief exposition of the revolutionary crisis brought on by the imperialist war and of the conditions under which the Communist Party was created.

2) An analysis of capitalist production and the development of modern capitalist society, the formation of the working class, the creation of conditions for the social revolution within capitalist society.

3) The analysis of the imperialist era of capitalism, of the imperialist war, its consequences, the sharpening of class antagonism, the civil war, the Russian Revolution as the beginning of the world proletarian revolution.

4) The influence of imperialism and the imperialist war on the development of the Balkans and Bulgaria, the new conditions for the struggle of the party, its aims in this period.

The second part of the program, the program proper begins by a statement of the final aims of the Party, and then suggests the demands for which the party will fight during the period of social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the transition period from capitalism to communism.

We have given a considerable place in our program to the general conditions of the Balkans, to the conditions under which the Balkan Communist Parties must fight and prepare for revolution. In this way we believe that we can create a program which may serve as a model for the other Communist Parties in the Balkans. At the same time our program states the tasks of the Balkan Communist Federation as a necessary organisation to prepare for the final victory of the revolution in the Balkans.

The Maximum Program of the Communist Party.

We are faced with the question whether the Communist Party should have a maximum and minimum program for the period of transformation. The Communist Party cannot accept a minimum program such as that of the social democratic parties before the war, because the Communist Party bases itself on the conception that capitalism has entered a severe crisis which inevitably and rapidly will cause its final disruption, its downfall, and that the duty of the proletariat to-day is not adaptation—for this was the sense of the old minimum program—but to accelerate

the downfall of capitalism and the victory of the revolution.

Furthermore, political demands in the minimum program cannot be realised so long as the bourgeoisie maintains its power by a class dictatorship, even in the minimum program cannot be realised either because of the economic crisis, the high cost of living and the destruction of capitalism.

The Communist Party believes that capitalism has entered the revolutionary crisis and that we are witnessing the beginning of the proletarian world revolution.

This is why the main task of the proletariat and of the Communist Party is the conquest of political power and the realisation of the maximum program.

Can the Communist Party have a Minimum Program?

This is the question before us in the period before the conquest of power—which now seems longer than in 1918 and 1919—may the Communist Party renounce all demands within the limits of capitalism? Of course not. But these demands have not the same significance nor the same importance as in the old minimum program; they are only transitory demands from which the working class will rise to the larger demands of the maximum program. To-day, these demands have revolutionary significance; they are a step in the growth and intensification of the proletarian struggle.

Among these demands some are of more temporary nature and depend upon the momentary condition of the struggle; they must be put up as slogans (demands of the hour).

The others are more durable. They contain the more important demands for which the Communist Party will fight until the conquest of power; they have a place in the program. But being of a temporary nature they do not determine the maximum demands and the conditions of the struggle; on the other hand, since the struggle for their realisation always brings us inevitably to the question of the conquest of power, and the realisation of maximum demands, we cannot give these major minimum demands an independent place in the program. They must be added to the ma-

ximum program and come at the end of the maximum demands.

The Program of the Russian Communist Party.

To determine the maximum demands of the program we must make use of the experience of the Russian Revolution and the program of the Russian Communist Party.

The program of the Communist Party of Russia contained that which the old Social Democratic Parties lacked, which was the principal defect of those previous programs; the Russian program states concretely the task of the proletariat during the social revolution for the conquest of power and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, for the destruction of the capitalist state and the old regime, for the construction of the new State and socialist society.

The principal aim of the Communist program is to bring out these principal tasks of the revolutionary proletariat. In this matter one cannot ignore the experience of the Russian Proletarian Revolution which is of world historical importance.

The Communist International and its national sections must make use of the great experience of the Russian revolution which has given the true content of the proletarian program for the whole world, which has shown completely what the demands and the means of struggle during the proletarian revolution should be.

Naturally, this does not mean that we must copy the Russian program; it means merely that we must use it as a guide in carefully studying the true conditions of each country and determining the program of each party by taking into account its special conditions.

The Tactics and Program of the Communist Party.

The question presents itself: must the program answer all questions on tactics which may be asked of the Communist Party during the present period? In the program we must give the general lines of our tactics, taking into consideration the principles of the Communist Party and the conditions of the present historical epoch, but we cannot now designate

the special application of these outlines at any given moment.

Should the Program of the Communist Party be a Program of Action?

The question has been raised: Should the program of the Communist Party be a program of action, or not? The program of the Communist Party should be a program of action, but it should also be something more: A program of principle. That is to say that the Communist program should not be a platform with the temporary demands of the moment, but a theoretic exposition of our historical conception; and at the same time the program should include those principal demands for which the revolutionary proletariat will struggle during the transitory period leading up to the conquest of power, and during the proletarian dictatorship.

The Tactics of the Communist Party of Bulgaria in the Parliamentary Struggle.

Now I must reply to certain criticisms which have been made regarding our proposals for a program. Comrade Bukharin has said that we have given too much place to parliamentarism and not enough place to the methods of the revolutionary struggle. This reproach is not well-founded. The Bulgarian Communist Party immediately after the first Congress of the Communist International, and at the same time as it affiliated with the Communist International, adopted a "Declaration program" (in the Party Congress of May 1919) which contained the principles and tactics of the Communist International. This "program declaration" made use of the experience of the Russian revolution and states that the following are the principal tasks of the Party: The conquest of political power through the struggle of the toiling masses and the poor peasants, a struggle which must develop to the point of armed insurrection and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship exercised by the workers' and peasants' Soviets. But at the same time the Bulgarian Communist Party did not abandon participation in the electoral struggle, both for parliament and municipalities. This is different from certain Communist

Parties which, after the victory of the Soviets in Russia, ceased to participate in parliamentary struggles. The Bulgarian Communist Party has continued with ever more energy and increasing success, to take part in these campaigns. In the parliamentary elections it has succeeded in rallying to its flag more than a quarter of the voters of the country, and it has captured a whole series of rural and urban administrative bodies. The Party achieved these parliamentary successes through propaganda and a struggle based upon revolutionary demands. The struggle of the Party within parliament and the municipalities is indissolubly bound up with the struggle of the great masses of the workers and peasants, with the mass action of the Party, and with the continual growth of the membership of the Party and of its influence over the masses.

The Party fights for the overthrow of the capitalist State and all its organs—from parliament to the police and the army—and for the establishment of the soviet republic. Thus the tactics of the Bulgarian Communist Party do not contradict those of the Communist International but are, in fact, in conformity with the parliamentary tactics adopted by that body. It is in full accord with the thesis on parliamentarism passed by the Second Congress of the Communist International, and the parliamentary tactics adopted by that body.

In our program proposals no greater importance is attributed to parliamentary action than it deserves. It would perhaps be better to place this passage of the program in chapter one, concerning the soviet republic, in which bourgeois democracy is characterised as follows: "Under the mask of democracy, the capitalist State supports the power and privileges of a minority composing the capitalist class, at the expense of the great majority of the disinherited and exploited. To-day the bourgeoisie maintains its rule through persecution and blood-thirsty terror and even when it establishes the democratic republic it maintains its domination by means of a dictatorship exercised through the police, the army and the whole apparatus of the capitalist State."

Parliament and the Constitutional par-

liamentary regime are but instruments of dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Revolutionary Methods of Struggle.

Our program has enumerated the various methods to be used in the revolutionary struggle for the conquest of political power, as follows:

"The proletariat will accomplish the social revolution by seizing political power and establishing its class dictatorship..." And again: "The imperialist war has brought in the epoch of social revolution. During this period the maximum program of the Communist Party attains immediate and practical importance in the struggle of the international proletariat.

"The experience of the Russian Revolution and of the revolutionary movement in other countries, has clearly indicated, not only the demands of the proletariat, but the means of their realisation: notably the organisation of the workers, and the struggle of the working masses for their immediate ends, leading up to the political general strike and armed insurrection.

"The revolutionary classes (the workers and poor peasants) must seize the political power of the State by armed force: they will crush the opposition of the bourgeois and the counter-revolution, and in this manner they will ensure their domination and the complete victory of the revolution, etc."

Thus, the most important methods of the revolutionary struggle are indicated in our proposed program.

The Revolutionary Demands of the Communist Party.

The objection that the maximum demands in our program are formulated in too concrete and detailed a manner, is not justified. It is true that our program has not confined itself to general and vague formulas, and that it has attempted to give an exact and clear definition both of the maximum and minimum demands of the Communist Party, but the program does not go into superfluous details which might hamper our work on the morrow of our conquest of power.

We repeat the fact that the proletariat must prepare itself for the conquest of power and for the proletarian dictator-

ship. The date of the revolution cannot be decided at present, but the general economic and political crisis in the capitalist world might cause it to break out in the very near future, for example in Central Europe or in the Balkans. With this prospect before us, which we should always keep in view, the Communist Parties, the vanguard of the working class revolutionary movement, must have a clear and precise program for the accomplishment of their task the day after their rise to power. Besides this, a concrete and clear maximum program, without being too detailed, is a powerful means of communist propaganda and education, and the rallying point for the masses to the Communist Party.

In conclusion, it is true that no programs are worth anything without a real revolutionary movement of the proletariat. On the other hand, it is also true that every proletarian movement, which has no substantial theoretical basis and a clear revolutionary aim, is condemned to impotence, and to be a tool in the hands of the capitalists.

In the actual period of social revolution, through which we are living, when the importance of the Communist International and of the Communist Parties increases every day, when the social patriots, with the working masses who are under their influence, serve as the principal support for the domination of the bourgeoisie—in this moment, the Communist International and its affiliated parties should have a program founded upon our basic theory, the Marxian theory, and a program which expresses in the clearest manner the demands of the revolutionary proletariat.

Kolaroff: Comrades, we have heard the three reports on the communist program, the next question is, what will be our procedure. Shall we open general discussion, with the object of leading to a vote by the Congress on a proposed program? Or shall we postpone the discussion of the program and the decisive vote until the next Congress?

The German delegation has unanimously decided for the postponement of the discussion and the decisive vote to the next Congress, but the Russian delegation has asked the Presidium for an op-

portunity to consult among themselves on this question.

Now with regard to this question as to whether we must immediately discuss and vote on the program, or whether we shall postpone this until the next Congress, the Presidium has not thought it possible to render a decision. But it believes that satisfaction should be given to the Russian delegation by permitting it the possibility to formulate its position on this question of procedure.

The Presidium also proposes that no

session be held to-morrow, Sunday, nor any meetings of Commissions. (Applause).

Therefore the next session will be held on Monday at 11 o'clock in the morning precisely—emphasis on the word "precisely." We shall commence, as we did to-day, at the appointed time, whatever number of delegates may be present. The question of the day will be the trade union question, Reporter: Comrade Lovovsky.

The session is now closed.

(The session closed at 8.15 p.m.).